



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,285	11/26/2003	Debargha Mukherjee	200310818-1	1157
22879 7590 09/21/2010 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528			EXAMINER PATEL, JAY P	
			ART UNIT 2466	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 09/21/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/724,285

Applicant(s)

MUKHERJEE ET AL.

Examiner

JAY P. PATEL

Art Unit

2466

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7-11, 14-18, 20-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6, 12, 13 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15-18, 20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandell (US Patent 6944161 B2) further in view of Washisu (US Patent 6393215 B1) further in view of Green (US Patent 6600432 B2).
2. In regards to claims 1 and 2, Sandell teaches, determining a next PTR value (PTR') from a valid received PTR (a reference point in the bit stream) value and on the basis of the old sequence number SN (a numerical offset value) (A method for updating an offset in a bit stream subsequent to bit stream segment drops using a descriptor comprising descriptor data comprising a reference point in the bit stream and a numerical offset value having the ability to determine a pointer) (see column 15, lines 26-34).
3. Sandell further teaches with respect to figure 7b, step s16, receiving an indication whether a second type cell (STC) is missing (see column 16, lines 7-10).
4. However, Sandell fails to teach evaluating whether the sequence number (offset value) expected is missing.
5. Washisu however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Washisu teaches that when an offset removal is determined (determination that the offset has been dropped)

to within a predetermined range, a correction is carried out (see column 19, lines 52-57).

6. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the determination of a removal of an offset bit as taught by Washisu into the teachings of Sandell. The motivation to do so would be to make adjustments in the bit stream.

7. In further regards to claims 1 and 2, Washisu and Sandell fail to teach, shifting a portion of descriptor data to the next or previous byte or setting the offset value to zero when the offset value has been dropped from the bit stream and having an indication to do so.

8. Green however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Green teaches byte offset of 0 by 400 translating into shifting the offset to the left by 3 (see column 6, lines 1-3).

9. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of shifting bits as taught by Green into the teachings of Washisu and Sandell. The motivation to do would be to provide correct shifting of the bit stream.

10. In regards to claim 3, Sandell teaches the a new PTR' can be determined using determining a next PTR value (PTR') from a valid received PTR value and on the basis of the old sequence number SN (see column 15, lines 26-34).

11. In regards to claim 4, in Sandell's method, a valid second type cell with a pointer value has to be received first (see column 15, lines 28-30).

12. In regards to claim 8, in Sandell step s13 figure 7b, if a valid pointer is received, a sequential storage position is assigned using the pointer (see column 15, lines 42-46).

13.

14. In regards to claims 9 and 11, Sandell teaches, determining a next PTR value (PTR') from a valid received PTR (a reference point in the bit stream) value and on the basis of the old sequence number SN (a numerical offset value) (A method for updating offsets in a compressed bit stream upon dropping data from the compressed bit stream using a descriptor) (see column 15, lines 26-34).

15. Sandell further teaches with respect to figure 7b, step s16, receiving an indication whether a second type cell (STC) is missing (see column 16, lines 7-10).

16. However, Sandell fails to teach evaluating whether the dropped data from the compressed bit stream comprise at least a portion of the numerical offset value.

17. Washisu however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Washisu teaches that when an offset removal is determined (determination that the offset has been dropped) to within a predetermined range, a correction is carried out (see column 19, lines 52-57).

18. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the determination of a removal of an offset bit as taught by Washisu into the teachings of Sandell. The motivation to do so would be to make adjustments in the bit stream.

19. In further regards to claim 9 and 11, Washisu and Sandell fail to teach, adjusting at least one of the reference point and the pointer when dropped data from the

compressed bit stream comprises at least a portion of the numerical offset value and shifting at the reference or the pointer value.

20. Green however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Green teaches byte offset of 0 by 400 translating into shifting the offset to the left by 3 (see column 6, lines 1-3).

21. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of shifting bits as taught by Green into the teachings of Washisu and Sandell. The motivation to do would be to provide correct shifting of the bit stream.

22. In regards to claim 10, in Sandell step s13 figure 7b, if a valid pointer is received, a sequential storage position is assigned using the pointer (see column 15, lines 42-46).
23.

24.

25. In regards to claim 15, Sandell teaches, determining a next PTR value (PTR') from a valid received PTR (a reference point in the bit stream) value and on the basis of the old sequence number SN (a numerical offset value) (A method for updating offset values associated with compressed resource bit stream after bit stream data drops using a descriptor comprising offset information) (see column 15, lines 26-34).

26. Sandell further teaches with respect to figure 7b, step s16, receiving an indication whether a second type cell (STC) is missing (see column 16, lines 7-10).

27. However, Sandell fails to teach evaluating the compressed resource bit stream for dropping of offset information from the descriptor.

28. Washisu however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Washisu teaches that when an offset removal is determined (determination that the offset has been dropped) to within a predetermined range, a correction is carried out (see column 19, lines 52-57).

29. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the determination of a removal of an offset bit as taught by Washisu into the teachings of Sandell. The motivation to do so would be to make adjustments in the bit stream.

30. In further regards to claim 15, Washisu and Sandell fail to teach, repositioning offset information when the compress resource bit stream includes dropped offset information from the descriptor and repositioning the reference point.

31. Green however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Green teaches byte offset of 0 by 400 translating into shifting the offset to the left by 3 (see column 6, lines 1-3).

32. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of shifting bits as taught by Green into the teachings of Washisu and Sandell. The motivation to do would be to provide correct shifting of the bit stream.

33. In regards to claim 16, Sandell teaches the a new PTR' can be determined using determining a next PTR (a reference point) value (PTR') from a valid received PTR value and on the basis of the old sequence number SN (an offset value) (see column 15, lines 26-34).

34. In regards to claim 17, Sandell, Washisu and Green teach all the limitations of parent claims 15 and 16 as stated above.

35. Washisu and Sandell fail to teach, evaluating the compressed resource bit stream for dropping of offset information comprises evaluation the compressed resource bit stream for the dropping of the offset value.

36. Green however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Green teaches byte offset of 0 by 400 translating into shifting the offset to the left by 3 (see column 6, lines 1-3).

37. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of shifting bits as taught by Green into the teachings of Washisu and Sandell. The motivation to do would be to provide correct shifting of the bit stream.

38. In regards to claims 18 and 20, Sandell teaches the a new PTR' can be determined using determining a next PTR (a reference point) value (PTR') from a valid received PTR value and on the basis of the old sequence number SN (an offset value) (see column 15, lines 26-34).

39. In regards to claims 22 and 23 Sandell teaches, determining a next PTR value (PTR') from a valid received PTR (a reference point in the bit stream) value and on the basis of the old sequence number SN (a numerical offset value) (provides support for a method for updating offset values associated with a compressed resource bit stream and a descriptor comprising offset information) (see column 15, lines 26-34).

40. Sandell further teaches with respect to figure 7b, step s16, receiving an indication whether a second type cell (STC) is missing (see column 16, lines 7-10).

41. However, Sandell fails to teach evaluating whether the dropped data from the compressed bit stream comprise at least a portion of the numerical offset value and evaluating the compressed resource bit stream for the dropping of the offset value.

42. Washisu however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Washisu teaches that when an offset removal is determined (determination that the offset has been dropped) to within a predetermined range, a correction is carried out (see column 19, lines 52-57).

43. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the determination of a removal of an offset bit as taught by Washisu into the teachings of Sandell. The motivation to do so would be to make adjustments in the bit stream.

44. In further regards to claims 22 and 23, Washisu and Sandell fail to teach, repositioning offset information when the compress resource bit stream includes dropped offset information from the descriptor and repositioning the reference point.

45. Green however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Green teaches byte offset of 0 by 400 translating into shifting the offset to the left by 3 (see column 6, lines 1-3).

46. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of shifting bits as taught by Green

into the teachings of Washisu and Sandell. The motivation to do would be to provide correct shifting of the bit stream.

47. In regards to claim 24, Sandell teaches, determining a next PTR value (PTR') from a valid received PTR (a reference point in the bit stream) value and on the basis of the old sequence number SN (a numerical offset value) (provides support for a method for updating an offset in a bit stream subsequent to bit stream segment drops using a descriptor comprising descriptor data comprising a reference point in the bit stream and a numerical offset value from the reference point in the bit stream and the said reference point and said numerical offset value having the ability to determine a pointer) (see column 15, lines 26-34).

48. However, Sandell fail to teach evaluating whether the offset value (a pointer or a reference value) has been dropped from the bit stream.

49. Washisu however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Washisu teaches that when an offset removal is determined (determination that the offset has been dropped) to within a predetermined range (bytes proximate to the pointer and the reference point have been removed), a correction is carried out (see column 19, lines 52-57).

50. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the determination of a removal of an offset bit as taught by Washisu into the teachings of Sandell. The motivation to do so would be to make adjustments in the bit stream.

51. In further regards to claim 24, Washisu and Sandell fail to teach, updating the numerical offset value when the pointer or the reference value or the bytes proximate to them have been removed.
52. Green however teaches the above-mentioned limitation. Green teaches byte offset of 0 by 400 translating into shifting the offset to the left by 3 (see column 6, lines 1-3).
53. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of shifting bits as taught by Green into the teachings of Washisu and Sandell. The motivation to do would be to provide correct shifting of the bit stream.
54. Claims 7, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandell (US Patent 6944161 B2) further in view of Washisu (US Patent 6393215 B1) further in view of Green (US Patent 6600432 B2) and further in view of Kang (US Publication 2001/0014210 A1).
55. In regards to claims 7, 14 and 21, Sandell, Washisu and Green teach all the limitations of the parent claims. However, the above-mentioned references, fail to teach the use of XML to implement the respective method of the parent claims.
56. However, Kang teaches detecting offset using XML (See paragraph 17).
57. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of XML as taught by Kang into the teachings of Sandell, Washisu and Green. The motivation to do so would be to use a platform independent language.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-6, 12-13 and 19 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAY P. PATEL whose telephone number is (571)272-3086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs.: 8:00 a.m. - 6:30 p.m. .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel J. Ryman can be reached on (571)272-3152. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. P. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2466

/Daniel J. Ryman/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2466